HUMAN EVENTS

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Vol. XVII, No. 1 Thursday, January 7, 1960 Washington, D. C.

News Section

ROCKEFELLER: *The inside story* ..... (page 1)

The GOP's way to win .... (page 3)

MORSE: *The Democrats' Stassen* ..... (page 3)

STRIKE: *Judges enforce law and order* ..... (page 3)

FILM: *Scientists say it's not so* ..... (page 4)

The Rockefeller Rout: On Boxing Day (the English term for the day after Christmas), Nelson Rockefeller dropped his obviously futile effort to box in the GOP nomination and took himself out of the race. He called a halt to the farcical public relations machinery deployed against this or that policy of the Eisenhower Administration. (A few days before he said "enough," his staff machine had set up—believe it or not—an "image division" and a "position division," staffed with many absurd relicts of the Democratic New Deal.)

Dispassionate British and French correspondents in the Capital did not waste much cablese on the matter, giving a summary judgment that Rockefeller had simply recognized he had no significant popular support and no substantial Republican party support. He had to bow out as soon as possible, for the developing rout might have injured his chances of re-election as Governor in 1962. All manner of polls all over the Nation, including the private polls he paid for himself, had demonstrated that his support among the masses was woefully slight. His trips to visit party leaders found the latter frigid, and the few who really welcomed him were found to be party dissidents with personal grudges—rag-tags and nondescripts of no importance.

Private advices to Nelson from friends in New Hampshire came as a staggering blow. In the Granite State on March 8 quadrennially the first big primary test occurs. Nelson would have to make up his mind soon whether to enter or not. But the advice from Concord was that Senator Styles Bridges had lined up the Governor and practically all the principal political figures in the state GOP. Public announcement of Governor Wesley Powell's assumption of the the reins of the Nixon caravan in that state came a few days before Rocky bowed out.

One by one the assets on which he had counted had evaporated. But there was one more—the money and power of the Rockefeller interests. Would he dare an attempt to personally "buy the nomination?" Old hands in the party in Washington still were not convinced that Rocky would bow out, because the pressure of Rockefeller billions had not yet been fully applied. They recalled the Wall Street pressure exerted to put over Willkie in 1940 and Eisenhower in 1952 (see HUMAN EVENTS for December 2, 1959).

Others had remembered these circumstances and had warned that a similar performance would provide the Democrats in the general election campaign with suitable demagogic material. The Los Angeles *Times* on the West Coast and HUMAN EVENTS in Washington sounded warning bells.

The word spread through the business community and the consequences provided the *coup de grace* to Nelson's candidacy.

What Happened—According to reliable sources of HUMAN EVENTS—not only business in general, but banking and oil interests in particular developed a strong allergy against Nelson's bid for the nomination, for varying reasons. Independent leaders of great New York banks had long been reacting against the enormous Chase Manhattan Bank, the Rockefeller banking institution.

Indeed, some banking mergers in recent years had come about to counteract the power of the mammoth Chase Bank—notably, the merger a year ago of the Morgan bank and the Guaranty Trust Company. Obviously, these strong "independents" did not want to see a Rockefeller in the White House.

Among the oil men, formidable opposition mounted behind the closed doors of trade meetings. One tycoon stormed: "We don't want some new Ida Tarbell to arise and pillory the whole industry simply because Nelson wants to be President." There's no monopoly in the industry today as there was a half century ago, but trade circles recall how Tarbell and other writers arose—and rightly so—to demand break-up of old John D's great Standard Oil monopoly. A number of Standard companies which became "independents" after the 1911 dissolution were among the most vehement to demand that old embers be allowed to grow cold. According to HUMAN EVENTS informants, even in the last remaining Rockefeller-dominated oil firm—Standard of New Jersey—voices were raised against the Nelson bid. One and all felt sure that Democratic demagogues would seize a Rockefeller nomination as an excuse to make trouble for the whole industry.

Spurring this sentiment among high oil and business circles were confidential reports from Washington that the Democrats, expecting a Nelson victory at the GOP convention, were readying some inflammable campaign material well calculated to beat him in the election. Some of it would come from the hearings of Representative Wright Patman's Small Business Committee which featured fearsome-looking charts of the interlocking directorates of big companies and big banks—particularly the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, unnoticed in the press, the final and decisive negative for the Nelson Rockefeller Presidential ambition for 1960 came to a climax in recent weeks behind closed doors of high finance and business. This may explain why the abdication announcement on Boxing Day came as such a surprise, even to many usually well informed people in the Government and the press.

One man—according to Capital dopesters—foresaw what was coming, in view of his excellent pipe-lines to big companies. That man was former Governor Thomas E. Dewey, who—a week before Nelson bowed out—asked for a date with Vice President Nixon and had dinner with him in Washington. Dewey reportedly "sweet-talked" the Vice President and thus sought to lay the groundwork for future amiable relations.

The Aftermath—The words used by Nelson in renouncing his candidacy have caused a tumult among GOP regulars. Rockefeller said he had found that "a great majority of those who will control the Republican convention stand opposed to any contest for the nomination" and therefore his "quest" for nomination would require "massive" struggle, for which—he said—he would have no time.

"Ungraceful," "unsportsmanlike," "harmful to the party," "traitorous"—were some of the party reactions. Certainly, Rocky handed the Democratic propagandists a lead for their eventual attacks on Nixon (whom Rocky never mentioned in his farewell address) and the Republicans—"party bossism."

Indeed, Senator Lyndon Johnson (a hopeful for the Democratic nomination) immediately called Rocky a "progressive" and urged that the Democrats "when they win in 1960" offer the New York Governor a "high office" in the Democratic Administration!

The Vice Presidency—Speculation about Nixon's running mate mounts, usually with the assumption that a Presidential candidate always chooses his No. 2 man. Historically that is not true, it is pointed out. In 1920, neither Harding nor the group who won him the nomination chose the Vice President; quite the contrary. This group wanted Senator Lenroot of Wisconsin. A spontaneous revolt on the floor of the convention swept the party delegates and they selected Calvin Coolidge. Among the Democrats, Adlai Stevenson threw open the way to a free selection of his Vice Presidential candidate at the 1956 convention. It is predicted that rising anger at Rockefeller's method of bowing out will prevent any serious attempt to draft him for the No. 2 spot.

However, other names are brought up by regular Republicans for the Vice Presidency. Senator Barry Goldwater is frequently mentioned, although "geography" militates against such a choice. Both Nixon and Goldwater come from the Far West; the pros want to balance the ticket with someone from the Middle West or the East.

House GOP leader Charles Halleck of Indiana is also proposed, as a man who could help the GOP in the Middle West.

But the most exciting suggestion for the No. 2 man is Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire. An older man than Nixon, he would provide the anchor of long political experience to keep the GOP ship steady; his prestige is high not only in the East but in other parts of the country, not the least in the South. It was Bridges who engineered the vital write-in victory in New Hampshire of Nixon in 1956 for the Vice Presidency, when Stassen sought to block him. And it was Bridges who this year was largely responsible for the overwhelming lead among Granite State people and pros for Nixon.

National Chairman—Already names are mentioned for the position of National Chairman of the GOP once Nixon receives the nomination. Senator Hugh Scott is one Republican proposed, but many demur. It was Scott who was Dewey's hand-picked Chairman in 1948; he ran party affairs in that memorable disaster, when Dewey "snatched defeat from victory" (see *Out of the Jaws of Victory,* by Jules Abels, Holt, $4.95).

A far better choice, it is remarked, would be Leonard Hall, who served as National Chairman when Eisenhower won the 1956 campaign; and who has recently been acting as a sort of unofficial chairman of Nixon's campaign.

What's Next?—Despite much jubilation among Capitol Hill conservatives over Rocky's rout and retirement, veterans lift a warning finger. They believe that the forces of Modern Republicanism behind the abortive Rockefeller effort are still strong and have six months to reform their ranks. It is pointed out that a close reading of the text of the Rockefeller announcement the day after Christmas indicates that he is not ruling out a draft at the convention. Unlikely as this may seem now, no one can accurately chart the course of events in coming months.

Louis B. Seltzer, "liberal" editor of the powerful Cleveland *Press,* Scripps-Howard's most lucrative property, confirms the above warning. Seltzer, whose political predictions over 24 years reportedly have been 82 per cent accurate, said last week that "it would be a serious mistake" to rule out Nelson Rockefeller as a Presidential nominee.

What may well take place—say observers—is another offensive mounted by the Modern Republicans, perhaps with some other "liberal" as leader. It would not be surprising if "liberal" pundits bring up the name of Chief Justice Earl Warren. He was boomed by the "liberals" at the time when Ike suffered his first coronary attack. Those who study his attitudes believe he has never given up ambition for the Presidential spot; nor his dislike for Vice President Nixon. Only last summer, the press reported how Warren had a verbal altercation with a correspondent who had written favorably of Nixon. A Willkie-type blitz before the Republicans meet in Chicago cannot be excluded from consideration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How to Win—Capitol Hill notes, with irony, the kindly efforts of "liberal" pundits (who never vote GOP anyway) to persuade Nixon to court what they call "the independent and Democratic voters." This is an old game of these columnists who thereby helped Dewey to "snatch defeat out of victory" in the 1948 election. The smart thing for the Nixon high command, say veterans on Capitol Hill, would be to forget that "independent and Democrat" formula and go after the 40 million non-voters. The most practicable way to capture a decisive fraction of this 40 million would be to utilize the hard core of the GOP. If real enthusiasm were to be built up in this hard core, it could serve as the "sales force" for the ticket and could bring in sufficient numbers of the 40 million non-voters to bring victory.

The same pro-Democratic pundits are now trying to scare the Nixon camp with the claim that what they call the "Old Guard" brought about Rockefeller's downfall. If the "Old Guard" did bring this about, then the country in general must be "Old Guard"—indeed, a distinct possibility. For polls of all kinds, local and national, sampling and mass, indicated a huge majority (75 per cent or more) for Nixon and only a small minority for Rockefeller. It seems obvious that by and large these polls reflected what most politically-minded Americans were thinking. And the poll results must have had no little influence upon the *cadres* (precinct workers, county chairmen, state committees, state chairmen, etc.) of the GOP. Therefore the latter gave the New York Governor the chilly reception (when he called on them on the tours across the country) which swayed his decision not to run.

And if these cadres are "Old Guard," they must be but a pale reflection of the reflexes among the "Young Guards." For the Young Republican organizations of the country are well known to be more conservative than their seniors in the GOP.

Witness the conservative program voted, and the conservative leaders elected at conventions of the Young Republicans in recent years. Witness, especially, the convention in Denver last summer, when conservative leaders, favoring Nixon over Rockefeller, were voted in with a whoop, together with a conservative platform.

Witness, also, the surprise upset victory of "Old Guard" John Kyl (40 years old, incidentally) in the significant by-election in the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, crushing a well-heeled Democratic New Deal candidate. "Old Guardsman" John Kyl, up until two years ago, was an active member of the Young Republicans.

Vain Morse: Current amazing spectacle: the Senator from Oregon, Wayne Morse, with all the fervor he displayed in crucifying Clare Boothe Luce or Lewis Strauss, is on the stump for his own nomination as Democratic candidate for the Presidency. Political writers in the Capital discounted the seriousness of this bid—Marshall McNeil, Scripps-Howard reporter, mentioning the five senatorial aspirants (Kennedy, Symington, Johnson, Morse and Humphrey), remarked: "Of these, only Senator Morse knows for sure he won't get the nomination, but he could kill off one or more of the others."

Yet, the same day, "Vain" Morse appeared with a letter in the Washington *Post* in which he wrote: "Let me assure you that I shall campaign to win the nomination."

Albert Lea: Non-strikers went quietly back to work at the strike-bound Wilson Co. meat packing plant in Albert Lea last week, despite the prediction of awesome violence by Minnesota's Governor Orville Freeman. No violence occurred when a court order lifted martial law imposed by the Governor and outlawed mass picketing.

As noted in the December 23 issue of HUMAN EVENTS, Freeman used the "fear of violence" excuse not only to call out the National Guard, but to close down the meat packing plant as the mob of strikers had wished.

But a three-man Federal court, although upholding Freeman's right to call out the Guard, castigated him severely for closing the plants. Said the unanimous court:

"The imposition of the drastic action [martial law] and the curtailment of constitutional rights of citizens of a state resulting from a declaration of martial law cannot be sustained except in situations of dire necessity. We are convinced that situation has not as yet risen in Freeborn county . . . .

"We cannot subscribe to the principle or doctrine that a governor of a state may bow to the demands of a law-violating mob that a plant under strike shall be closed when neither the local or state authorities have used all the means available to them to suppress the mob by invoking enforcement of the laws of the state . . . . " (It is interesting to note that the "liberal" press which condemned another governor, Orval Faubus, for using the National Guard to close the schools because he feared rioting, did not utter a peep about Freeman's actions, which deprived non-strikers of working.)

Although the court curtailed one of the Governor's actions on behalf of the union, Freeman put up a constant propaganda barrage against Wilson, even blaming the company for the strike. Freeman went so far as to tell the president of Wilson, James H. Cooney, that to prevent mob action he must agree to hire back *all* of the strikers, apparently even those who had committed illegal actions and stoned non-strikers. Cooney properly replied that this was "a matter to be negotiated at the bargaining table . . . . "

ERNEST P. MULLER, History Department, Bates College (Maine): "HUMAN EVENTS is a very useful and compact statement of the conservative evaluation of the present complex course of public affairs."

M. R. MERRILL, Political Science Department, Utah State University: "I believe students in social science should be acquainted with the viewpoints represented in HUMAN EVENTS. They are important to a well-rounded education."

GEORGE P. WILSON, JR., Chairman, Speech and Drama Department, University of Virginia: "HUMAN EVENTS is especially valuable as source material for our Virginia debaters, and for students in our basic public speaking course."

BURTON W. MARVIN, Dean, School of Journalism, University of Kansas: "We find HUMAN EVENTS particularly useful as we make an effort to expose our students to varying viewpoints on public issues—particularly in the editorial course."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Further, Freeman issued his attack the same day he had been assured by Wilson attorneys that "striking employees will be rehired to the extent that they have not been legally replaced and to the extent they have not been guilty of illegal acts."

"Unemployed Areas": An urgent telegram by Representative Kenneth Gray (D.-Ill.) was sent to President Eisenhower requesting him to visit "areas of unemployment" and see "thousands in dire circumstances" in southern Illinois. "If some hope is not given," warned Gray, "I can assure you there will be no Merry Christmas or Happy New Year for thousands of your fellow Americans."

Gray, apparently, is of the same mind as Senator Paul Douglas (D.-Ill.), who initiated legislation which if passed next session would let "depressed areas" dip into the Federal feed bag for $389.5 million just as a starter. (See "New Outlet for Tax Billions?" in HUMAN EVENTS for December 23, 1959.)

The Marion (Ill.) *Daily Republican*, however, tells Gray, Douglas and the ADA who are pressing for aid to depressed areas that "there are no 'thousands in dire circumstances' in southern Illinois. The honest facts are that, with a few exceptions, one at West Frankfort, and another in the fluor spar area, employment is better than one year ago. There are over 1000 more persons employed now in this area than there were employed on the same date a year ago . . . . That fact can be proved but the committee headed by Senator Douglas made no effort to obtain that information . . . . "

Socialist Decline: Add Canada to the list of countries whose Socialist-Laborite parties are on the downgrade. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, a farmer-labor alliance which lost 18 of its 25 parliamentary seats in the 1958 Conservative landslide, has been trying to reorganize on a union-subsidized basis, with heavy backing from the Canadian Labor Congress.

However, the CCF was brought up short by one of its few remaining members of Parliament recently. Harold Winch, long regarded as the most radical of the party's radicals, returned from a world tour with his eyes opened and gave a speech which one correspondent said "might have been written by Henry Ford, Sr." Winch told organized labor: "Yes, you can maintain your standards, but remember that the rest of the world doesn't owe you a living." He reported that Canada was in danger of pricing itself out of world markets, and all the international good will it has will not help it.

The speech jolted the CCF's laborite wing, which now is trying to drown Winch out with manifestoes and study groups, but the party's farm supporters (now comprising most of its parliamentary strength) are also opposed to high labor costs which they must pay in high farm equipment prices. Very little is holding the party together at this point, say veteran Canadian reporters.

"Beach"-Baloney?: New York *Herald Tribune* science editor Earl Ubell in a recent article called the Stanley Kramer atom-banning film "On The Beach" (HUMAN EVENTS December 30) "fair game for critical appraisal."

After describing the film's presentation of the Australian survivors of an atomic war sitting around drinking for five months waiting for radiation to catch up with them, then proceeding to pop suicide pills into their mouths, Lasker Science Award reporter Ubell writes:

"It just couldn't happen that way. Coincidentally with the premier of the picture, the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy published texts of hearings held last June on nuclear war at which experts told what might happen. 'It ["On The Beach"] is probably pure fiction from a world-wide fallout point of view,' Dr. Frank Shelton, then of the Department of Defense, told the committee.

"Even Dr. Linus Pauling, Nobel Prize chemist and a constant critic of the Administration's atom bomb policy, admitted to this reporter that 'On The Beach' couldn't happen."

Ubell says that a 10-ton megaton hydrogen bomb could rain lethal radioactivity upon a "local" area of 1500 to 2000 square miles. It is not technically possible to explode enough H-bombs in the Northern Hemisphere to destroy all life in the Southern Hemisphere. Furthermore, according to Dr. Pauling, everything would cool off within a few hours, or at most—weeks.

Even within the range of radioactivity, Ubell says basement shelters would reduce fallout deaths by two-thirds. Persons in unattacked areas could store clean food and water, enclose themselves, take chemicals to flush the radioactivity out of their bodies.

Lilienthal Aid?: Two former TVA chairmen, David E. Lilienthal and Gordon R. Clapp, are board chairman and president, respectively, of the Development and Resources Corporation of New York, which has been doing contract work for the Government of Iran for several years. While in Iran recently, "liberal" CBS newsman Edward R. Murrow cornered Lilienthal for a filmed television interview.

In a discussion on foreign aid, Lilienthal said: "One of the greatest ideas certainly in our lifetime is that people who are well-to-do in the world, relatively, the people who have enough food and who have reasonably good shelter, who have partial industrialization, who have many of the other physical necessities of life, have an ethical obligation as human beings, as children of the same God, to the billion and a half people in the world who do not have these."

For "doing so much for humanity," the Development and Resources Corporation headed by Lilienthal and Clapp—two outstanding New Dealers of the Roosevelt-Truman era—collected a cool $27 million from the Government of Iran in 1958, $7.3 million in 1957. Iran, incidentally, received a total of $58 million in non-military foreign aid from the US during fiscal years 1957 and 1958.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. For change of address send old address (EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). *ALLOW US 2 WEEKS to process new subscriptions and changes of address.*

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

degree from the procedures officially designated for him, he can expect to acquire the reputation of being a troublemaker.

The decline of competition between the members of the new bourgeoisie has been paralleled by an equal or even more effective elimination of competition between members of the laboring class. For they, too, have found security in the protective embrace of organization. The bureaucratic organization of business and industrial enterprises has of itself tended to regularize their employment and standardize the conditions under which they work. But more than this, they have evolved their own guildlike union organizations to protect each from the many, and the many from the danger that the one might through misguided and selfish enterprise attempt to improve his personal station in life. In so doing, they have inadvertently encouraged the bureaucratization of business and industry, deliberately destroyed the free market for labor, and—intentionally or not—more or less closed the door of opportunity to the individual who is by the misadventure of birth a member of the laboring class.

The effect of the old trade-unionism had been to increase, at least in some places and times, the skilled worker's share of the national product; but this form of unionism placed only limited constraints upon the business entrepreneur, since normally only a small proportion of his employees would be both skilled and unionized; and for the same reason it did little to check upward individual mobility. The advent of the new, industrial type of labor organization has, however, contributed to the historical trend toward large-scale and bureaucratic business and industrial organizations and has at the same time bureaucratized the position of the individual worker.

Though this development is far from complete, organized American labor is already for the most part committed to a policy of stability in all respects and at all costs. The wage escalator clause, through which wages are tied firmly to the cost of living, has become standard in the labor contracts of steel, automobile, and other large industrial organizations. The guaranteed annual wage that is the current goal will, no doubt, also be tied to the cost of living.

THROUGH SUCH METHODS the industrial unions propose to establish a floor under labor, providing every class of worker with an assured minimum wage. At the same time, the industrial unions have been endeavoring, with considerable success, to establish seniority as the principle upon which hiring, firing, and promotions are to be based. Forgotten, or ignored, is the fact that wage floors usually turn out to be also wage ceilings, and that where seniority rules, merit is seldom rewarded.

The new unions are highly bureaucratic of necessity; and the goals to which they aspire are certain to make the individual worker increasingly a function of his designated role—both within the union and within the the organization by which he is employed. As this is happening, the opportunities for the individual worker to distinguish himself from his fellows by his own efforts and thus, perhaps, improve his personal position are steadily contracting. Union rules, unemployment and pension rights, seniority rights—all these and many other factors tie him to the job he has, and discourage if they do not actually preclude his moving in search of a better place. Thus in many ways the new unionism tends to freeze the position of labor in the economy and the position of the individual worker in the labor force.

If present trends toward stabilizing the position of labor continue, upward mobility—so long the ideal of the American people—will become a thing of the past; and the laboring class will tend to become a hereditary caste, or system of castes, each with its own fixed function and status. But long before then the debilitating consequences of this rigidity will have reduced the American economy, and indirectly the entire social system, to a monolithic structure incapable of any enterprise. For as the labor force is brought increasingly into large, bureaucratic, and quasi-monopolistic organizations, the opportunities for the independent business entrepreneur are diminished, and the advantages to large organization, established labor relations, and quasi-monopolistic control of sources of supply and of the market for goods are intensified.

IT SHOULD NOW BE EVIDENT that the modern American businessman must operate in a climate of bureaucracy rather than, as in times past, one of comparative freedom. He is controlled from above by a wide variety of political agencies, each a bureaucratic organization with some specialized function and with inherent tendencies toward stabilizing all that it affects. He is controlled from below by bureaucratic union organization; and the pressure upon him will be to stabilize his operations in order that labor can be assured constancy of wages and employment. Moreover, organized labor in considerable measure designates for him how he shall use his various types of workers; it requires that he honor seniority rather than merit in the employment and advancement of the members of his labor force; and it does everything in its power—which is considerable—to discourage him from displacing workers by introducing new productive processes.

Under these circumstances it is no wonder that business organizations are becoming increasingly bureaucratic themselves; for only by becoming bureaucratic can they adjust to the bureaucratic demands upon them. The wonder is that American business organizations have been able to maintain any semblance of dynamism; and it speaks for the enterprise of the leaders of American industry and commerce that they are still able to maneuver in new directions the unwieldy organizations over which they have command. The present leaders are, of course, products of the older and freer enterprise system; and it remains to be seen what their successors, products of bureaucracy and skilled mainly in the arts of bureaucratic routine, will do when they come to assume command.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "HOW MODERN 'GUILDISM' KILLS INCENTIVE" at $_____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 1 HUMAN EVENTS January 7, 1960

LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Article Section I

Union Monopoly is Modern Guildism

By Richard LaPiere

This article is excerpted from a new book, The Freudian Ethic, *by Richard LaPiere, professor of sociology at Leland Stanford University. The Freudian Ethic is defined as the idea that "man cannot and should not be expected to be provident, self-reliant, and venturesome; that he must and should be supported, protected and socially maintained." Professor LaPiere analyzes the changing psychology of the American people and shows how—as a result of the acceptance of the Freudian Ethic—they are losing the very qualities that until now have made American society dynamic.*

The Freudian Ethic, *published by Duell, Sloan and Pearce, may be obtained from* Human Events, 408 *First St., S. E., Washington* 3, *D. C., at the bookstore price*—$5.

The medieval guilds began as voluntary associations of workers in a given craft or trade, and initially their function was more religious and recreational than economic. Shared occupational interests plus a special patron saint led them to foregather for worship and congenial activities. In time, each craft and trade came to maintain its own guildhall; soon these halls were being used to house single members of the guild; and thence it was but a step to the regulation by the guild organization of the work activities of the individual members.

As such regulation evolved, the guild ceased to be a voluntary organization; for it was no longer possible for an individual craftsman to join or not as he saw fit. If he was to work at his craft or trade, he had to belong to the local guild; and if he gained guild membership, he thereby lost the right to do his work in his own way. He became subject to a plethora of regulations. His position *vis-a-vis* all the other members of the guild was specified in detail; the conditions under which he could work, how he did his work, and his reward for work accomplished were all determined for him by guild rule; and his opportunities for advancement—if any—depended upon the guild rather than his own efforts.

The guild system reduced the individual member to an organizational functionary, depriving him of the right to be enterprising and favoring the one who was by temperament or training passive and lacking in initiative. Where and when the guild system functioned effectively, it was reasonably efficient in providing the individual with economic security and comparative freedom from personal responsibility for his own economic welfare. But from the point of view of the community as a whole the guild system was exceedingly inefficient. It kept guild membership small; it restricted the hours of labor or units of goods produced; and it held prices so high that the general standard of living could not rise.

Moreover, and in the long run even more disadvantageous socially, it prevented any improvements in the techniques of production. During the apex of its development and power, the guild system brought all economic life to a standstill; and in accomplishing this guild objective, it placed a high premium upon member conformity and made the exercise of individual initiative well-nigh impossible.

The medieval guild survived as a type of occupational organization until mechanization of the productive processes rendered it utterly obsolete. But its role in the economic and social life of Western peoples declined steadily through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and toward the end the guild could be maintained against the competition of new and more virile forms of organizations only by the force of governments that were, in terms both of forms and functions, quite as antiquated as the guilds. The political revolutions of the late eighteenth century were actually a revolt not only against a restrictive government and its hereditary elite, but against the whole system, the guilds included, that operated to limit the individual to traditional modes of life and to discourage the exercise of individual initiative.

The new guildism, like the old, involves the reduction of work activities—craft or trade, scientific or professional—to rule and rote. In many instances this is being accomplished simply by the failure to abandon old procedures as new and more effective ones are evolved, with the result that occupational operations become cluttered with antiquated practices. For the most part, however, this aspect of the new guildism is coming about through deliberate bureaucratization of business, industrial, educational, professional, and other work organizations.

To anyone who has been inducted into the individualistic values and sentiments of the Protestant ethic, subservience to the rules and regulations of an office may appear to be a humiliating violation of the dignity of man. It certainly reduces severely the scope of action and forces the bureaucratic officeholder to rely as a worker upon the wisdom and judgment of the bureaucratic system rather than upon his own personal abilities. He cannot, therefore, secure the kind of personal gratification that comes from doing something on one's own —from assuming responsibility, exercising initiative, or excelling one's associates.

His long-run welfare depends in the first instance upon his earning a reputation both among his occupational peers and superiors of being sound, and in bureaucracy the soundness of a man is measured by the meticulousness with which he adheres to the rules of his office. If he performs his designated functions effectively—that is, if he does what is required of him promptly, does no more, and does nothing else—he will be well liked by his associates, and can be expected to be promoted up the hierarchy in accordance with the rules affecting promotion. If he deviates in any significant

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Professor Frederic Heimberger, a political scientist at Ohio State, declared: "As a member and loyal supporter of the AAUP for 25 years I am shocked and dismayed by this action. There was not the slightest semblance of a fair hearing." Professor Howard L. Bevis said: "There is no longer any reasonable doubt that members of the Communist party are part of a conspiracy to overthrow the Constitution of the United States by force if necessary. Furthermore, no party member is free to hold or express thoughts or opinions at variance with the current party line. In our judgment, therefore, no party member is fit to become or to remain a professor of a state university."

Not only did the AAUP censure colleges which refused to keep Communist professors and praise those which retained them, but it refused to censure American University for firing an anti-Communist *professor. Shortly before the AAUP convention got underway in* 1956. *American University fired Professor Herbert Fuchs, a former Communist who broke with the Communist movement and cooperated with the Government in helping to expose the Communist conspiracy.*

A NUMBER OF DISTINGUISHED Americans immediately protested to President Hurst Anderson. Reinhold Niebuhr wrote him: "I would like to challenge this decision on moral grounds. If a man has been involved in the Communist conspiracy and has made a clean breast of it, is there any moral reason why an institution should dismiss him?" Educators George Shuster, Harry Gideonse and George Counts brought the Fuchs case to the attention of the AAUP in convention assembled. Surely if the AAUP could censure a college for firing a Communist professor, it could censure an institution which fired an anti-Communist professor. But such was not the case.

In 1958 the AAUP blackballed the University of Michigan for firing two professors who refused to testify concerning their alleged Communist affiliations, and Dickinson College was censured for dismissing a faculty member who refused to deny Communist affiliations under oath. At the 1959 convention in Pittsburgh, the AAUP censured New York University for having fired two professors with Communist affiliations: Lyman Bradley and Edwin Berry Burgum; it also censured Fisk University for dismissing Professor Lee Lorch, who had improperly invoked the 1st Amendment in refusing to divulge information about his Communist connections.

The AAUP exercises such a powerful influence in the academic world that most institutions, rather than face the consequences of censure by it, prefer to change their own rules and standards, including those relating to the tenure of subversives. The power of intimidation of the AAUP was manifested in 1958 when Temple and Rutgers both amended their constitutions to delete clauses making it possible to fire Communist professors who refused to deny Communist affiliations under oath. In so doing both schools removed the stigma of censure which was attached to them in 1956. In addition, the University of California promised to offer reinstatement to all those faculty members who quit over the loyalty oath controversy. In this way the university's 1956 censure was removed.

In addition to the strong protests which were made after the 1956 AAUP convention about the arbitrary decisions arrived at, and the failure to censure American University, there has been a mounting wave of criticism of the AAUP policy on Communist professors. Professor Arthur O. Lovejoy, one of the original organizers of the AAUP, has stated that membership in the Communist party renders the member unfit to be a college teacher. With respect to professors who invoke the 5th Amendment, President John S. Dickey of Dartmouth had this to say: "Such a man either genuinely believes his words may incriminate him or he is using the privilege improperly. On the first assumption he, by his own action, avows the existence of what can reasonably be regarded as disqualification for service in a position of respect and responsibility; on the other hand, if he has invoked the privilege without truly believing that he needed its protection, he has acted falsely toward his Government. Either way you take it, it seems to me we must say as a matter of general policy that such a person has compromised his fitness to perform the responsibilities of higher education . . . ."

THE EVIDENCE that Communists are unfit to be teachers in a free society (obviously they are fit for slave societies) is overwhelming, on both sides of the Iron Curtain. The continued refusal of the AAUP to face the facts, together with its refusal to condemn the firing of anti-Communist professors like Herbert Fuchs, Medford Evans and others, makes clear the necessity for a new professorial organization. Possibly the nucleus of such a group exists in the committee being formed by Professor Revilo Oliver of the University of Illinois to look into the matter of Professor Evans' dismissal by Northwestern University (Louisiana).

There are plenty of professors who are fed up with the antics of the AAUP. Will they be free enough and courageous enough to establish a new organization which will take into consideration the facts of life, from Katyn to Tibet? Today, as the United States enters into the critical phases of its struggle with the forces of total blackness, it deserves the support of the academic community, the same support it received in the struggle against fascism.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "ACADEMIC FREEDOM OR COMMUNIST CODDLING?" at $_____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 1 HUMAN EVENTS January 7, 1960

Article Section II

U. S. LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS WISCONSIN

Academic Freedom or Communist Coddling?

The Curious Stand of the Professors' 'Union'

By ANTHONY TRAWICK BOUSCAREN
(Professor of Political Science, Le Moyne College)

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION of University Professors is to the education field what the AFL-CIO is to industry. And just as union coercion has succeeded in the past in bringing recalcitrant businesses into line, so has the AAUP succeeded in most instances in coercing our colleges and universities into accepting its curious standards of academic freedom. AAUP disapproval of an educational institution's stand on Communist professors, in particular, is not to be taken lightly.

Indeed the AAUP is sufficiently broad-minded to favor the retention on a university faculty of both "bad" and "good" Communists. A few years ago the AAUP *Bulletin* (Vol. 37) reprinted an article by Robert Maynard Hutchins ("Ethics," January, 1951) which stated in part: "A man who is a bad member of the Communist party may conceivably be qualified to be a professor because he has retained his independence; and a good member of the party may be qualified to be a professor if he retains his independence in the field in which he teaches and conducts his research."

Recently the AAUP gave its highest award to Alexander Meiklejohn, another educator who has forthrightly defended the "rights" of *present* members of the Communist party to teach in our schools on the same terms as anybody else. Professor Meiklejohn, although admitting that Communists are under "an unusually rigid and severe discipline," concluded that nevertheless they "are moved by a passionate determination to follow the truth where it seems to lead." (*New York Times Magazine*, March 27, 1949.)

The AAUP has not deviated from the stand it first took in 1947 on Communist teachers: "So long as the Communist party in the United States is a legal party, affiliation with that party in and of itself should not be regarded as a justifiable reason for exclusion from the academic profession" (as quoted by Sidney Hook, in *Heresy, Yes—Conspiracy, No*, p. 271). Writing in the spring issue of the AAUP *Bulletin* in 1948, a one-time chairman of AAUP Committee "A" (Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure), Professor Shannon, declared: " . . . the evidence that the Communist party in the United States is subservient to the dictates of international communism, which means the Communist party of the Soviet Union, is not conclusive." *

A former president of the AAUP, Professor Kirkland, writing in the autumn issue of the AAUP *Bulletin*, 1950, stated: "In brief, we should exclude from the academic arena not only those who are incompetent and dishonest but those of such authoritarian mind that they do not believe in the practice of free inquiry and who, if they were in power, would deny its exercise to others, perhaps on the specious justification that error cannot be given the same opportunity as truth." No doubt Professor Kirkland had in mind Nazis, Fascists, racists, Ku Kluxers, etc. *But he clearly did not have in mind Communists!*

The professors who escaped from East Germany and other Communist countries no doubt could enlighten the AAUP on the nature of Communist education and authoritarianism, but the question arises, is the AAUP capable of enlightenment? Here we are in the 15th year of the Third World War; * the massacres of Katyn and the Chosin reservoir, the Czech *coup d'etat*, Berlin blockades, the repression in Hungary, the 150,000 American casualties in Korea—all these events are in the past, but the AAUP thinking is still that of 1947.

IN 1956 the AAUP condemned Washington University for firing two Communist professors, and censured the following educational institutions for firing Communists and those who refused to deny Communist affiliation under oath: University of California, Ohio State, Temple, Jefferson Medical School, Rutgers and Oklahoma. The AAUP held that the only reason for firing a professor is because of "incompetence, lack of scholarly objectivity or integrity, serious misuse of the classroom or of academic prestige, gross personal misconduct, or conscious participation in conspiracy against the Government." But it made clear that under this rule a college could not fire a *present member* of the Communist party unless he proved unfit as a teacher. Nor could it fire a professor solely because he refused to deny Communist affiliations under oath. At the same convention the AAUP praised the following schools for resisting the "pressures" of investigating committees: Cornell, Harvard, M. I. T., Sarah Lawrence, University of Chicago and Johns Hopkins.

Each of the censured schools had only ten minutes to defend itself, and the whole procedure of the 1956 convention smacked of star chamber proceedings. To many AAUP members it looked as though the AAUP was far from giving the accused campuses the same treatment it was demanding for professors. Author George R. Stewart, Professor of English at the University of California, angrily informed AAUP leaders: "I am walking out. I will return to the University of California, where I shall inform my colleagues that the action you have taken here is tyrannous. I shall also tell them that they should wear their censure proudly as a badge of torture given by a tyrant."

*According to Sidney Hook, rank and file AAUP members have never had an opportunity to pass on the policies of Committee "A," nor are dissenting views tolerated in the AAUP *Bulletin*.

*It started in December, 1944, with the Communist uprising in Greece.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED